





L 2

VIEWS
OF
COLONIZATION.

BY

REV. JAMES NOURSE, A. M.

"STRIKE, BUT HEAR ME."

PHILADELPHIA :
MERRIHEW AND GUNN, PRINTERS,
No. 7 *Carters' Alley.*
.....
1837.

209 CAGE
E 44 S
N 58
1837

COLONIZATION.



CHAPTER I.

THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.—MOTIVES AND OBJECTS OF ITS AUTHORS AND SUPPORTERS.—IS THE COLONIZATION SOCIE- TY ENTITLED TO THE AID OF BENEVOLENCE?

Is it such a fast that I have chosen?—
Is not **THIS** the fast that I have chosen?
To loose the bands of wickedness;
To undo the heavy burdens;
To let the oppressed go free;
And that ye break every yoke.

Isaiah, lviii. 5, 6.

SECTION 1. *The Colonization Society.*

The Colonization Society was organized in Washington City, near the commencement of the year 1817. The Constitution of the Society declares that “the object to which its attention is to be exclusively directed, is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing, (with their own consent,) the free people of colour residing in our country, in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient.” The Society has been in operation for more than twenty years, during the greater part of which period, it has been steadily pursuing its object; not, however, confining its labors to the removal of those persons who were free before their removal, but removing others that they might be free. Among the individuals most prominent in procuring its organization, were Dr. Finley of New Jersey, and Samuel J. Mills. Much approbation was bestowed upon the Society, as well by many distinguished men in the Southern States, as in the Northern. The first important measure of the Society was to send a mission of inquiry to Africa, and for this purpose Mills and Burgess sailed from Philadelphia, November

16, 1817, and spent about two months on the African coast, surveying it and seeking for a place of settlement. Early in 1820, the Society removed from Georgia a number of recaptured Africans, with some free people of colour, amounting to eighty, and made a temporary settlement on Sherbro Island, where they were attacked by disease; and three agents and twenty of the colonists were carried off by death. In the spring of 1821, Messrs. Andrews and Wiltberger, agents of the Society, and Messrs. Winn and E. Bacon, agents of the United States, came on the coast with additional colonists, and after encountering great difficulties, failed in purchasing land for a colony. This, however, was accomplished afterwards, by Dr. Ayres, and Lieut. Stockton of the United States Navy, who succeeded at length in this object, by the purchase of Mesurado, a cape and territory. Here a settlement was soon begun, by the colonists who had formerly settled at Sherbro, but had in the mean while removed to Fourah bay in the neighborhood of Sierra-Leone. Several difficulties occurred with the natives, but were settled by Dr. Ayres, who shortly left the colony on a visit to the United States. In the mean while Mr. Ashmun arrived and found himself scarcely settled, when it became necessary to defend the colony by arms, from a murderous attack of 800 natives, November 11, 1821, and of 1500 on the 2d December. These were driven off, not without the loss of many lives on the part of the natives, and some of the colonists. Mr. Ashmun remained in the colony till the year 1828, when on account of ill health he returned to the United States; only, however, to die among his friends. During the period of his agency, the colony, governed with much prudence and ability, increased in importance and population. And since, the several reinforcements from the United States, with a union of some few settlers, having constantly added to the number, the population now amounts to about 4.000. These are scattered over a large space, in several settlements; some under the patronage and care of different societies which have sprung up in aid of the American Colonization Society. To all appearance at present the colony seems to

be flourishing, and though improvements have been slowly entered upon, owing to the circumstances of the case, and the character of the settlers, yet there is a spirit to advance. The expenses amounting to more than \$500,000 have been defrayed, partly (*See Reports of American Colonization Society,*) by individual donations, and in part by the State Legislatures, of some of the slaveholding States.

SECTION 2. *Motives and objects of the Authors and Promoters of Colonization.*

This plan of colonizing the free people of colour, was proposed originally through kindness and christian philanthropy on the part of Dr. Finley, Samuel J. Mills and many others. The projectors concluded that no other plan, was then practicable, by which the people of colour could be raised from their generally depressed condition, and allowed to enjoy the full blessings of freedom. "We were at Washington, in December 1817, and there met the Rev. Dr. Finley and the Rev. Samuel J. Mills, and in conversation with both these gentlemen, heard them both advocate African Colonization, as *the only practicable method of ultimately extinguishing slavery in the United States.*" (*Colonization Herald, Philadelphia 1836.*) That the motives of such men as have been named were good, no doubt can be entertained; yet it must be carefully examined whether the views and judgments which gave impulse to those kind feelings were correct. These good men, however, were not the only persons who encouraged and patronized the Colonization scheme, when it was first projected. That the views of others were widely different, the Colonization Society has itself admitted. Some espoused it, as a means of ridding the slave States of their free coloured population ; considering the residence of that class, in a land of slavery, dangerous to themselves and to slavery. "The Hon. Charles F. Mercer had, for some time previously to the establishment of the Society, made its design a subject of much reflection, communicated his sentiments to others, and by a well-timed effort in the legislature of Virginia, secured the

adoption of resolutions, which had unquestionably much effect upon the decisions of the meeting which organized the institution, and a most favourable influence upon its earliest operations." (*Af. Repos.*, vol. I. 88.) Mr. Mercer, in a report to Congress, March 3, 1827, speaks thus:— "All must concur in regarding the present condition of the coloured race in America, as inconsistent with its future social and political advancement, and where slavery exists at all, as calculated to aggravate its evils without any atoning good. Their own consciousness of their degraded condition in the United States has appeared to the North as well as the South, in their repeated efforts to find a territory beyond the limits of the Union, to which they may retire. Anterior to the year 1808, three several attempts to procure a country suited to this object, had been secretly made by the General Assembly of Virginia;—the last, but at the same time the *earliest public effort* to attain this object, was made by the Legislature of the same State in December, 1816, some time before the formation, in the city of Washington, of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour. The design of this institution, the committee are apprised, *originated* in the disclosure of the secret resolutions of prior Legislatures of that State. This brief and correct history of the American Colonization Society, evinces that it sprung from a deep solicitude for *southern* interests, and among those most competent to discern them." (*Af. Repos.*, IV. 53, 54.*)

*The Christian Spectator, October 1835, charges Mr. Jay with dishonesty, in representing the Colonization Society as originating in Virginia; or being connected with the resolutions of the Virginia Legislature. It may be doubted, however, whether the Spectator is not itself liable to a retort of the charge; or will it for once confess itself a little ignorant of the true, or at least the admitted state of the case. The reader may consult the *African Repository*, Vol. I. p. 88, and compare it with Vol. IV. p. 54, and the following statements. "In the year 1816, the Legislature of Virginia, solemnly impressed with the momentous interest of the scheme, and deprecating the increasing dangers of delay, appealed with an almost unanimous voice to the general government for its aid in procuring an asylum for the reception of its free coloured population. Influenced by these examples, some fifteen or twenty of the best and wisest men of the nation, formed themselves into a society, called "The American Society for Colonizing," &c. (*Cyrus Edwards, Af. Repos.* VII. 99.) "The Northern States have sent us some good things—they have sent us men who have become useful and good citizens, [i. e.,—a thing very common,—

In the same report, Mr. Mercer touches upon the inconvenience and danger of multiplying manumissions, (pp. 52, 53,) and subsequently declared his conviction, that slaves ought not to be liberated in this country; for, "emancipation and colonization must go hand in hand." (*Af. Repos.*, IV. 363.) This gentleman, however, with truth, may be viewed as the representative of a class of supporters differing from the first, who, while they would not justify slavery in the abstract, justify its present practice and continuance under the circumstances of the case. Others, of different mind, united with the Society at first; Jackson and Calhoun were among its early officers—"its most important officers," (*Af. Repos.*, I. 90,)—and "John Randolph, that remarkably tenacious holder of slaves, that unflinching advocate of slavery, through evil as well as good report, and who could pronounce the Declaration of Independence, because it asserts the doctrine of equal rights, a 'fansaronade of nonsense,' took a prominent part in forming the Colonization Society."* (*Af. Repos.* XI. 67.) That *Slavery is a sin*, is the doctrine of a free and enlightened country; that *Slavery is an evil*, but not a sin in present practice, is the old but now antiquated Virginia doctrine: that *Slavery is neither a sin, nor an evil*, and is never to be abolished, is the old South Carolina doctrine, now in the ascendant:—all these harmonized in the institution of the Colonization Society.

"However difficult it might have been supposed in execution, it was an obvious remedy; and the suggestion may be referred back to a period as remote as the revolutionary war." (*Henry Clay*, *Af. Repos.* VI. 13.) "From

they became slaveholders,] but they did not send us the Colonization Society—this is an institution of our own."—(*Rev. Mr. Atkinson*, *Af. Repos.* XII. 65.) But what does the Society itself say? After referring to the acts of the Virginia Legislature, December 1815, and quoting the preamble and resolutions, it adds,—"*Encouraged by this movement on the part of a State so distinguished as Virginia, and so deeply interested in the subject of the resolution*, a number of gentlemen, friendly to the plan of African Colonization, assembled in the city of Washington," &c. (*Af. Repos.* XII. 51.)—Perhaps however, the Spectator will call even this evidence dishonest, inasmuch as it contains an acknowledgment of a desire to aid Virginia,—"*so deeply interested*."

* Mr. Randolph changed his views before he died.

its origin and throughout the whole period of its existence, it [the Colonization Society] has constantly disclaimed all intention whatever of interfering, in the smallest degree, with the rights of property, or the object of emancipation gradual or remote. It is not only without power, but it is without inclination to make any such interference." (*Idem.*) We will therefore consider it unquestionable, notwithstanding the surmise of many to the contrary, that this representation is true at present. It is indeed a representation, not only made by the distinguished civilian whose name is connected with it, but repeated by every advocate of the Society.—About the time of its organization, Dr. ROBERT FINLEY of New Jersey, the Father of the Society, wrote thus—"what shall we do with the free people of colour? What can we do for their happiness, consistently with our own?—are questions often asked by the thinking mind. The desire to make them happy has often been felt, but the difficulty of devising and accomplishing an efficient plan, has hitherto appeared too great for humanity itself to accomplish.—At present, as if by a Divine impulse, men of virtue, piety and reflection are turning their thoughts to this subject, and seem to see the wished-for plan unfolding, *in the gradual separation of the black from the white population, by providing for the former some suitable situation, where they may enjoy the advantages to which they are entitled by nature and their Creator's will.* (*Af. Repos.* IX. 332., see also his letter, *Repos.* I. 2.) In these statements of Mr. Clay and Dr. Finley, it cannot be questioned with justice, that the authors express the views of Colonizationists generally. It is taken for granted, that the *free* people of colour *must remove*, in order to "enjoy those advantages," (more properly he should have said "rights," for he so meant,) "to which they are entitled by nature, and their Creator's will:" and this removal, so far as it respects *those now in bondage*, or hereafter to be, is to be effected, while still the right of property in slaves is acknowledged, or at least not openly, for the present, questioned.

It is remarkable, while this *removal of the whole co-*

loured population, is the supposed work of Colonization,---that there is no questioning of the propriety of that spirit and feeling in the community which renders their removal in any sense necessary or expedient. The language used upon this whole subject is generally such as the following: "Tax your utmost powers of imagination, and you cannot conceive one motive to honorable effort, which can animate the bosom, or give impulse to the conduct of a free-black in this country. Let him toil from youth to age in the honorable pursuit of wisdom—let him store his mind with the most valuable researches of science and literature—and let him add to a highly gifted and cultivated intellect, a pure piety, 'undefiled, and unspotted from the world'—it is all nothing:—he would not be received into the lowest walks of society. If we were constrained to admire so uncommon a being, our very admiration would mingle with disgust, because, in the physical organization of his frame, we meet an insurmountable barrier even to an approach to social intercourse; and in the Egyptian colour, which nature has stamped upon his features, a principle of repulsion, so strong as to forbid the idea of a communion either of interest or of feeling, as utterly abhorrent. Whether these feelings are founded in reason or not, we will not now inquire—perhaps they are not. But education and habit and prejudice, have so firmly riveted them upon us, that they have become as strong as nature itself, and to expect their removal, or even their slightest modification, would be as idle and preposterous as to expect that we could reach forth our hands, and remove the mountains from their foundations into the valleys which are beneath them." (*C. L. Mosby, Af. Repos. VII. 230, 231—see also Af. Repos. V. 51.*) This extract embodies the principle of Colonizationism. "*Education, habit, and more especially prejudice*"* against their colour, ren-

* "Men always hate 'and despise those whom they oppress, and thus attempt to cheat and silence conscience. It is because the negro has been oppressed, that he is hated and despised.---The prejudice against Jews seems quite unaccountable to us, but it has exactly the same foundation with our prejudice against negroes. It is founded in oppression and wick-

der it necessary, as is admitted by most of the intelligent Colonizationists themselves, that all coloured persons should remove. They affirm that these persons cannot be elevated in society here; but more, they acknowledge the depressions of that class, as they exist, but consider these depressions unavoidable: they ascribe also these depressions and injuries to the "prejudice" against colour. If we may judge from the published opinions of eminent Colonizationists, this is their rule of action.— "The scheme of African Colonization, offers in the first place to relieve the country from one of the *direst results of slavery*, the free black population:—They must go away or perish."—(R. J. Breckenridge.) Thus it has been the constant policy of the Colonization society to decry the free population, taking it for granted that they must and will emigrate to Africa in the course of time. "No scheme of Abolition will meet my support, that leaves the emancipated blacks among us. Experience has proved that they become a corrupt and degraded class, as burdensome to themselves as they are hurtful to the rest of society. Shut out from the privileges of citizens, they can never amalgamate with us, but must remain forever a distinct and inferior race, repugnant to our republican feelings and dangerous to our republican institutions. Free blacks are a greater nuisance than slaves themselves; that is generally speaking. There are many free blacks who are honorable, honest and enlightened; and for whom I entertain a sincere respect. Such of them as are otherwise, may justly ascribe it to their situation.—We can make it their interest to remove." (C. C. Harper, Af. Repos. II. 188, 189.) A "free coloured person has only a mockery of freedom here, and has turned his eyes to Africa, as his only resting place and refuge, in the deluge of oppression that surrounds him." (Idem, Af. Repos. III. p. 324.)—We do not question, therefore, the motives of the founders and

edness. The prejudice against the negro arises from oppression and wickedness, it is itself wickedness, and therefore it is neither justifiable nor invincible." (C. E. Stowe, Cincinnati, a Colonizationist, *sui generis*: standing as respects this sentiment in "lone conspicuity.")

supporters of Colonization, yet the fact is apparent—the principle of Colonization is, that the free people of colour must remove because of the *prejudice* which oppresses them here. Not only is this proved by the admissions and statements of Colonizationists themselves, but it is conclusively demonstrated by this fact, if the freemen who had once been slaves and their children changed their colour with their condition, there would be no talk of their removal. Indeed, it has been asserted by some Southerners, that if all the slaves were white, they would be emancipated.

Dr. Finley himself tells us that the good to be accomplished by the Society was three-fold. “A three-fold benefit would arise. *We should be cleared of them:* (i. e. the free coloured people;) *we should send to Africa a population PARTLY civilized and Christianized, for its benefit; and our blacks themselves would be put in a better situation.*” (*Af. Repos.* I. 2.) Admitting that this most estimable man “meant well,” we shall be obliged in justice to acknowledge that he took for granted what we have characterized as the PRINCIPLE OF COLONIZATION,—viz.: universal prejudice, supposed to be incorrigible. He took, indeed, more than this for granted—even a debateable principle in each of his three specifications. Benevolence ought to have inquired, *first*, whether, if human beings—responsible intelligences—were a “nuisance,” they could not be converted into something better; *secondly*, whether it would answer any very good purpose to Africa, to send thither those who were a nuisance here, and only *partly* civilized and Christianized; and *thirdly*, whether some better plan could not have been devised, by which “our blacks,” (i. e. slaves,) at home, could be put in a better situation. By being “put in a better situation,” he meant,—having the circumstances of their slave condition somewhat ameliorated, and a possibility opened for their gradual emancipation:—results which he supposed would be obtained by the removal of the free blacks, and the consequent increased feeling of security among the masters, leading them to treat their slaves with more lenity if they persisted in keeping them in slavery. This they

would of course do, if the scheme was feasible, because the pretended right of property in slaves would not be touched, nor invaded in the least degree, but rather rendered safer. These were the views of Dr. Finley, who is claimed by the Colonization Society as its parent. The errors of his views are to be ascribed to the times, and the state of society, as it then was. The slave trade was then tolerated: why should we expect that even American clergymen, residing in slave states, should go in advance of the age. On this ground we excuse him, but not many of his present followers.

The views of Robert Finley were the views of the Colonization Society at first; this may be gathered from its own documents. The Society at first contemplated all those objects which Dr. Finley mentioned. "Many seem to forget that this evil [slavery] can be diminished or removed only by the voluntary consent of those who feel it, and that there exists and can be devised for it no instantaneous remedy. Our sympathy for the weak, must never render us unmindful of the interests of the powerful. On the supposition that the influence of the Colonization Society is exclusively confined to the free coloured people of our land, it is impossible for any man not utterly indifferent to the welfare of two hundred and fifty thousand of his species, to oppose it. This object alone does the Colonization Society propose *directly* to effect." (*Af. Repos.* I. 226.) "If, however, in its progress, it should exhibit the benefits which would accrue both to masters and slaves by a voluntary dissolution of the bonds which unite them; should convince the Southern people and their legislatures, that emancipation might be both safe, practicable, replete with blessings, and full of honor; where, in this great republic, is the candid and Christian man who would regret the effect of its moral influence?" i. e. its influence to lead to emancipation, that the manumitted might be immediately colonized; or rather, that they might be removed in order to be manumitted. (*Af. Rep.* I. 34.) "But is it not certain, that should the people of the Southern States refuse to adopt the opinions of the Colonization Society, and continue to consider it both just

and politic to leave untouched a system, for the termination of which we think the whole wisdom and energy of the States should be put in requisition, that they will contribute more effectually to the continuance and strength of this system, by removing those now free, than by any or all other methods which can possibly be devised. Such has been the opinion expressed by Southern gentlemen of the first talents and distinction. In the decision of these individuals, as to the effects of the Colonization Society, we perceive no error in judgment; our belief is the same as theirs." (*Af. Rep. I. 227.*) It appears, then, that from the very beginning of its career, the Colonization Society, having one *distinct object directly* in view, aspired also to root out slavery by moral influence; and if it did not succeed in this way, owing to the attachment of slaveholders to their system, but could only accomplish its chief desire, to remove the free, the chains of the slave might then be more secure. This the Society avows. At the same time it declares itself to those who desire the removal of slavery, "*the only practicable method.*" But, in the name of common sense and all honesty, if you render the system of slavery more safe, do you not retard emancipation, and strengthen that system of robbery, and lust, and barbarism, and impiety? Indeed, at this present day, can the Colonization Society boast of its "*moral influence?*" If we would correctly estimate this, we must look at the mass of the slaveholding population, not at particular and isolated instances of generosity, which instances would all probably have occurred without the existence of the Colonization Society. What, then, has been its moral influence? Upon the slave laws? Are they not now more severe than ever? Have they not been growing worse year after year? Upon slaveholders? Are not manumissions now almost an hundred times less frequent in proportion to the mass to be manumitted, than they were twenty years ago? What, then, has its influence been?

But I am anticipating. To return, therefore, to the motives and views of the Colonization Society. In the passage last quoted, is discovered the reason why the Colo-

nization scheme was favored by individuals of eminence at the South, some of whom adopted one view of the Society's influence, and some another. Even some of the strongest advocates for slavery and its perpetuity, united under the belief that the influence of the Society would strengthen their hands as slaveholders—these were in Georgia and South Carolina. In 1820, even Charles C. Pinckney of Charleston, who was afterwards so violent an enemy of the Society, contributed to its funds; so did others with him to the amount of more than \$500. (*Af. Rep.* VI. 195.) At an earlier date the Society said, “some of our best and earliest friends reside in Georgia.” (*Af. Rep.* II. 11.) A reaction however took place, (*Af. Rep.* V. 215;) the moral influence of the Society could not convert the hearts of slaveholders. And in Charleston a most bitter toned hostility has been current for many years. Pinckney denounced the object of the Society, as “cruel and absurd,” and the Charleston Mercury styles it—“murderous in its principles and as tending inevitably to the destruction of the public peace;” and asks “whether the general government,” to which application had been made by the Society for aid, (and it is one of the avowed objects of the Society to obtain aid from government,) “will become an instrument in the hands of fanaticism, and act the abettors of the incendiary and assassin.” (*Af. Repos.* V. 196.) Numbers of the class of pro-slavery men have forsaken the Society, from different motives—yet none of them because they quarrelled with the principle of Colonization—that the free coloured people must go away.—The Colonization Society asserts in the labored defences of its policy, which from time to time it has found necessary to put forth, that it has never yet changed its views and action. This we admit, knowing that the Society and its advocates still consider that principle to be correct. The Society indeed has always been cherished by those who indulge this feeling, and scarcely by any others. Nay, should the Society once relinquish this principle, it must inevitably die.

There are other motives which influence Colonizationists in supporting the scheme. Some suppose that it will

be a means of preventing the slave trade on the coast of Africa, by their founding colonies of those who are opposed to that trade. Perhaps it may have some influence in this way, yet it is very evident that a surer way of suppressing the slave trade, is, to abolish all markets for human flesh. Others suppose that the Colonization Society, as Dr. Finley expresses it, will benefit Africa, by planting a colony there of partly civilized and Christianized people. This they imagine will open a door for the introduction of the Gospel into that vast continent. This may be, in a very partial degree, the effect on Africa, yet what reasonable man can doubt that the most effectual method of propagating the Gospel is, by the preaching and teaching of men who are not engaged in traffic with the ignorant natives to procure a subsistence or accumulate wealth. A commercial and trading colony is more likely to have the same effect on the uncivilized tribes of Africa, as the commercial and trading religious colonies of America have had upon our own aborigines.

SEC. 3. *Is the Colonization Society entitled to the aid of the benevolent?*

The Colonization Society asks to be tried, as to its principles and views, by the "*Constitution of the Society, interpreted by the recorded opinions and by the acts of its founders.*" (*Af. Repos. VI. 197.*) Unquestionably this is fair; and it is surely fair to consider the African Repository as expressing those views and principles. Let us give then the claims of the Society a fair trial. There is,

FIRST, a call on the benevolence of the community to remove to Africa the free people of colour,—who are "**THE DIREST RESULTS OF SLAVERY.**" (*R. J. Breckenridge, Af. Repos. IX. 327.*) "**ALIENS, political, moral, social aliens.**" (*H. Clay, II. 327.*) **NUISANCES.** (*C. C. Harper, II. 189.*) "**THE MOST DEGRADED AND MOST ABANDONED RACE ON EARTH.**" (*J. B. Harrison, III. 197.*) "**DEGRADED IN CHARACTER AND MISERABLE IN CONDITION, forever excluded by public sentiment, by Law, and by a physical distinction, from the most powerful motives to**

exertion.” (Af. Repos. I. 34.) A class introduced among us by violence, notoriously ignorant, degraded and miserable, mentally diseased, broken-spirited, acted on by no motives to honorable exertion, scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light; yet where is the sympathy and effort which a view of their condition ought to exert?” (Af. Repos. I. 48.) AN ANOMOLOUS RACE OF BEINGS, THE MOST DEBASED UPON EARTH, who neither enjoy the blessings of freedom, nor are yet in the bonds of slavery--who hang as a vile excrescence upon society.” (C. L. Mosby, Af. Repos. VII. 230.) “The negro is no where more ignorant, no where more debased than here.” (Rev. Mr. Bacon, New Haven, Af. Repos. I. 172.)—This is the people, at least thus characterized by the Society and its friends, whom the Society seeks to remove.

That very many of the free coloured population, are ignorant and vicious, and in a very degraded condition cannot be denied. ‘Yet where is the sympathy and effort which a view of their condition ought to excite?’ Some justification may be found for some of the expressions above quoted, yet whether such assertions are literally true after all is questionable. It is supposed by many that they are more vicious than slaves, or than the lower class of whites; but Gov. Giles of Virginia declares that the free coloured people of that State are freer from vice than either of the other classes.* And from the history

*“In relation to the free people of colour, I am far from yielding to the opinion expressed by the intelligent committee of the House of Delegates of Virginia, and the enthusiastic memorialists of Powhatan, respecting the degraded and demoralized condition of this *caste*: at least in degree and extent. It will be admitted that this caste of coloured population, attract but little of the public sympathy and commiseration—in fact that the public feeling and sentiment are opposed to it. It is also admitted that the penal laws against it have been marked with peculiar severity, so much so, as to form a characteristic to our whole penal code. When I first came into the office of Governor, such was the severity of the penal laws against that caste, that for all capital offences short of the punishment of death, and for many offences not capital, *slavery, sale and transportation*, formed the *wretched doom* denounced by the laws against the unfavoured, despised caste of coloured people. About two years since, this extreme severity of punishment was commuted.—During the existence of these extreme punishments, up to the present period, the whole population of this description

of crimes so far as we have it, in the South, it does not appear that this class is "most vicious" as Mr. Clay asserts. (*Af. Repos.* II. 343.) We have scarcely any data to estimate the comparative viciousness of slaves, because masters tolerate vices in their slaves which they judge they cannot cure,—because slaves seldom have trials by law,—because masters frequently sell their slaves for the commission of petty offences. But we do not deny that multitudes of the free coloured people of the North are vicious and debased. The statistics of crime prove this, and we know what trouble is occasioned in courts of justice by these people. Nevertheless, in estimating the comparative criminality of public offenders, their circumstances and their opportunities for obtaining information, must be taken into consideration.—These are the people whom the Colonization Society seeks to deport. It declares that here "they are under the foot of society"—and though society is regulated by Colonization influence,—it affects to believe that they can never be elevated in society or bettered in morals at home. It therefore holds out the hope that, if placed in a better situation, they would do better than they can be expected to do in this country. "Here" (they say) "invincible prejudices exclude them from the enjoyment of the society of the whites, and deny to them all the advantages of free-men. The bar, the pulpit and our legislative halls are shut to them by the irresistible force of public sentiment. No talents however great, no piety however pure and de-

of people may be considered, at the beginning, to be about 35,000, now increased to about 40,000 in despite of all the efforts of the Colonization Society, and notwithstanding the laws in favour of emigration and against immigration. During the existence of these extreme punishments, the annual conviction for offences did not exceed *eleven* upon an increasing population of 35,000. Since the commutation of the punishment, the annual average of convicts upon the increased population of 40,000, is reduced to *eight*. The proportion therefore of the annual convictions, to the whole population, is as 1 to 5000. These facts serve to prove almost to a demonstration, 1st, That this class of population is by no means so degraded, vicious and demoralized, as represented by their prejudiced friends and voluntary benefactors. And 2nd, That the evils attributed to this *caste* are vastly magnified and exaggerated." (*Letter of W. B. Giles, Gov. of Va., to Lafayette, 1829.*)

voted, no patriotism however ardent, can secure their admission." (*Henry Clay*, Af. Repos. VI. 17.) "If there is in the whole world a more wretched class of human beings than the people of colour in this country, I do not know where they are to be found. They have no home, no country, no kindred, no friends. They are lazy and indolent, because they have no motives to prompt them." (*J. A. McKinney*, Af. Repos. VI. 228.)—These exaggerated statements of both the worthlessness and degradation of the free coloured people, Colonizationists have insisted on, to excite a feeling on the part of the citizens of the United States, which will dispose them to aid in their removal, and at the same time to lead the free coloured people themselves to believe their situation so hopeless that it cannot be bettered here. But we may easily find in America, Europe, Asia, or Africa, "a more wretched class of human beings than the free people of colour." If, as none will deny, very many of the latter are pious Christians, are they not less wretched than the heathen—whether lettered or unlettered, polite or barbarous, refined or clownish,—whose conscience is their enemy, and who are living without God and without hope in the world. Indeed, Colonizationists themselves admit that if they are most vicious,—"it is the inevitable result of their moral, political and civil degradation." (*H. Clay*, Af. Repos., II. 343.) "The vices of this class do not spring from any inherent depravity in their natural constitution, but from their unfortunate situation. Social intercourse is a want which we are prompted to gratify by all the properties of our nature. And as they cannot obtain it, in the better circles of society, nor always among themselves, they resort to slaves, and to the most debased and worthless of the whites. Corruption and all the train of petty offences are the consequences." (*Idem*. Af. Repos., VI. 18.) "While they continue here, subject to their peculiar temptations, and their perpetual depression beneath the foot of society,—[the latter being the cause of the former,] they can never be saved from the impoverishment and moral corruption, which with rare exceptions have, to the present hour, been their lot." (*Address in North*

Carolina, Af. Repos., III. 66.) "Let them be maltreated ever so much, the law gives them no redress,* unless some white person happens to be present, to be a witness in the case." (*Af. Repos.*, VI. 228.)—"This multitude of beings reduced to that condition by our own policy and social state." (*R. J. Breckenridge*, Af. Repos., VII. 171.) "They are the most abandoned race on earth. How came they, thus? Alas it is *we*, we who have first crushed all cheerful hope of good to come, all taste for praise paid to virtue, by making them slaves; have completed the work by throwing them out on a world, where we are vain enough to expect from them actions without motives, efforts where there is no spring—where the passive qualities bring contempt, and the active bring no honor, and where vice in its worst shapes, from indolence up to felony, is their shadow, their familiar, their tempter." (*J. B. Harrison*, Af. Repos., III. 197.)

I. Now, in answer to the call of the Society for the aid of the benevolent, we ask, is it not strange that with all these acknowledgments, the only mode suggested and applauded by these gentlemen; the only mode by which they propose to answer a "national sin," to pay "a deep debt" to injured Africa!" to atone for injuries committed through prejudice; is, by carrying out that prejudice into further action, TO REMOVE THE INJURED FAR AWAY? One would suppose that the first effort after *confession* would be to make *reparation*. This is the gospel rule: this is even the Mosaic institute. The reparation would consist in restoring to them all of which they have been unjustly deprived. Yet not one word of censure is to be found in this African Repository, as conducted by the Colonization Society; not one word of censure of those customs and manners and prejudices and laws of the whites, which produce all this degradation and misery. Nay, unjust and tyrannical laws are in a measure approved. A deluge of oppression there is acknowledged to be, yet no barrier is placed in the way of that deluge. It rolls on still, without rebuke from the Colonization Society. There is

* The writer means, in the slave States---he is a Tennessean.

not south of the Potomac, nor in all the slave States, one solitary association for the protection of the free people of colour. Colonizationists of the South admit that they are often kidnapped; that they are not allowed to teach their children to read; that their evidence in courts of justice is of no value;—no matter how much some Colonizationists may “respect them,” or how much they may deserve respect, or how pious and upright they may be. Yet these wicked institutions, these miserable and contemptible prejudices, and these infamous laws must be still tolerated and enforced, that the free coloured people may see and feel and be convinced that they cannot stay in this country. One Colonizationist tells us that “Society is bound, and that *now and always*, to see that every man in it is fairly dealt by and justly paid by every other man in it; and every human being is bound to do justice to every body.” (*R. J. Breckenridge, Af. Repos., IX. 329.*) The same individual, while addressing a Northern audience —declares **SLAVERY to be a sin**; and two other Colonizationists, Mr. Smith, (*Af. Repos. XI. 105,*) and President Young, (*Af. Repos., XI. 120,*) expressed the same opinion. Yet no where do we find Mr. Breckenridge, or his friends, entreating society to deal fairly and justly with all persons in it. Nay, this graphic delineator of the evils of slavery as a system of robbery, lust, barbarism and impurity, even advances as *an argument for colonization* the fact, that coloured persons are driven from employment as draymen and drivers of hacks in Baltimore, in consequence of which many of them were on the verge of starvation. (*Speech in Washington City, Feb. 1834.*) We hear Colonizationists speaking thus in *confession*:—“we know that all of us have had our share in those institutions; in the injustice and prejudice which have first brought the now free coloured people to the degradation of slavery, and then bound them down to the ‘baseness of ineffectual freedom.’”—“Whether then we fear or loathe them, whether we feel compassion towards them, as a common feeling of humanity, or compunction as to those we have injured, cruelly injured,”—“*then in repentance and reparation WE MUST ALL DESIRE TO GET RID OF THEM*, and if

possible, to make better their condition thereby.” (J. B. Harrison, Af. Repos., III. 198.) Benevolent, truly! Worthy of a Christian people and an enlightened age! Again—“There are now (1826) at least five thousand free blacks in the city of Baltimore. We can make it their interest to remove. Every thing urges them to go. By their departure, thousands of places will be opened for our fellow citizens who are in want of employment. Into these vacant places will immediately rush a white population. The blacks we can provide with a home on the coast of Africa, whence they originally came, and where they may become, after their long captivity and dispersion, a flourishing and enlightened people, and enjoy under our protection those free institutions we have taught them to admire.” (C. C. Harper, Af. Repos., II. 188.) This is the sin and the repentance of Colonizationism. This, however, is not a new doctrine. It is coeval with Cain, and branched out both in Jew and Samaritan. This last extract, however, furnishes many topics for remark—and to a Christian mind cannot but provide, on a careful perusal, abundant subject of painful thought. I beg the reader to ponder it, in view of eternity. He will see plainly confessed, some of the most selfish and unjustifiable motives which can regulate the human mind. Pray, we might ask, how have you taught the coloured people “TO ADMIRE YOUR FREE INSTITUTIONS?” As slaves, by crushing them, oppressing them, chastising them for no crime, corrupting them and brutalizing them? Or as free people, by their “CONSTANT DEPRESSION BENEATH THE FOOT OF SOCIETY?” Reason, justice, nature, religion, God will say, “out of your own mouths will I condemn you.”

It is strange that an appeal is constantly made to the Christian public, both in America and Great Britain, to aid in a project which is so wanting in the first elements of Gospel charity. If indeed the Colonization scheme proposed to colonize or concentrate on the coasts of Africa, the wandering tribes, to teach them the arts and sciences, and the duties of civilized life, to give them all the “free institutions” of this misnamed free land, and to form stations whence missionaries and teachers under the guidance

of other associations might go forth to teach and instruct the natives in morals or religion or science, it would be a society commercial or political or what it pleased, and allied to the benevolent operations of the age. But even under such an organization, and with such objects in view, it would have little claim upon the benevolent of the United States, at least no right to call for their aid in this work, upon its own plea. But while it gratifies that prejudice which has so long crushed the coloured race in this land, nay, is the present chief means of keeping up that prejudice which has been the principal cause of their degradation and oppression, it has no claim. Much less has it a claim, than if it were merely a commercial or trading corporation. It is guilty of felony and sacrilege in thus perverting, as it does, the contributions of the benevolent, obtained by unsubstantial pretences, and thus gratifying prejudice at an enormous expense to the American Churches.

II. But the Colonization Society cannot claim the character of a benevolent association, *because it does not take the proper course in regard to slavery itself.* When vice and misery are to be weighed, and the perpetrators convicted and sentenced, what is the weight of a feather at the fulcrum of the beam? Such is Colonizationism in regard to the sin of slavery. It speaks not against it, as becomes a benevolent society. By its action it rather encourages the slaveholder than condemns him. It excuses his conduct. Is this consistent with that claim which it obtrudes upon us continually? Once the writer was a Colonizationist. He served the Society, repelled its gain-sayers, and endeavoured to advance its schemes both in the South and in the North, (See *Af. Repos.*, III. 349, 371, 378; IV. 64, 254.) but this was while he did not believe slavery to be a sin. He lumped together the "political and moral evils of slavery" as the contingent rather than the *necessary* concomitants of slavery itself. Indeed it is wonderful that any one can be a Colonizationist and yet believe slavery sinful; and think himself benevolent or acting under the impulses of benevolence, when he aids a Society which has not moral courage enough to rebuke a

system acknowledged to be one of “robbery, lust, barbarism and impiety,” legalized. Would any rational being reason in regard to any other sinful system, as Colonizationists do of slavery? If in the higher circles of Baltimore for instance, adultery were practised openly without shame, would the exposure of such a sin, and its prohibition by severe enactments, and its abolition attended by the breaking up of all criminal connections which had been formed for its commission, be productive of more evil than good? Impossible. Yet this is the sort of plea which the benevolent Colonization Society urges in support of slavery—the present infamous system of American slavery, with all its accompanying injuries to the free coloured people. This is the almost uniform plea; North, South, East and West it is reiterated. Strange that a benevolent Society should leave unrebuked a system of sin, which is causing those very evils it professes to labor to remove. Nay, stranger still, that in its appeals to the benevolent, the Society should urge its claim upon the very ground that it does not oppose slavery in a direct manner: i. e. that it neglects the first duties of humanity.*

III. *Can that be true benevolence which is directed only by prejudice?* In the Colonization scheme, there is no repentance for sin, no heart-breaking for that which is confessedly “against reason” and not justified by the gospel. On the contrary, there is a constant exercise of the sinful prejudice. Is this consistent with the rules of Christ? Does it coincide with the precept derived from the conduct of the good Samaritan? Is it not rather, “passing by on the other side?” Let us hear the admission of an eminent gentleman, who at the time he wrote it was a Colonizationist, and was altogether the most munificent and spirited patron of the Society. Hear what he says in respect to this prejudice.—The Colonization Society is opposed on the ground that “its members are prejudiced against the free coloured people of this country. I

* “Should the Society presume to touch the rights of individuals over the persons of their slaves, its influence would perish. It would at once be denied access to any slaveholding State.” (*Rev. W. W. Atkinson, Af. Repos., XI. 49.*)

admit that they are thus prejudiced, wickedly prejudiced. But is this prejudice peculiar to them? have they more of it than their countrymen generally have?—In that heartless and calculating policy, which we see has soiled the pure benevolence of its original character and earliest years, the Society is the guilty cause of encouraging the popular undervaluation and scorn of the man of colour.” (*Af. Repos.* XI. 71, 72.) We believe, however, that the benevolence of the Colonization scheme is the same it ever was. Its foundation stone was and continues to be prejudice. We do not say, that *all* which Colonizationists have done for the coloured people, is in consequence of all its members indulging prejudice and only prejudice at all times towards the coloured population; but we do affirm, what Colonizationists admit, that their “benevolent” scheme would not exist, be acted upon, or continue, were it not for this old and present and increasing prejudice. It resembles the *benevolence* of reconciled brothers, who having been long at variance, can correspond at a distance, call themselves “brethren,” but cannot bear to look each other in the face. They may agree perhaps to see each other without prejudice on a death-bed, in view of eternity, and fondly hope that there shall be no prejudice in their minds by and by. Such a reconciliation furnishes matter of repentance, in the hour of death.—Admitting that the free coloured people were all that the Colonization Society tells us they are---vicious and degraded most of all, does that justify the organizing of an association for their removal? Why not labor to convert them at home? especially since it is admitted that they are rendered vicious and debased, and continued so *by prejudice*? Or if vice and degradation are just causes of removal, why not organize associations to transport and expatriate to some point on the African coast, *WHITE nuisances*—thieves, manstealers, fornicators, adulterers, and abandoned men and women. This would be as benevolent as to carry away coloured men of the same character. The former class deserve transportation as much as the latter. If, society requires the removal of the one, how can it dispense with that of the other? But when we remem-

ber that in truth the alleged necessity of removal is, in the case of the coloured people, a mere creature of prejudice irrational and wicked, and that each removal, though it may produce a kind of relief for the individual exile, is destitute of any tendency to subdue, but rather operates to deepen and confirm that prejudice which expelled him, and at the same time to rivet new chains on his brethren, both bond and free, who are left behind, what then shall we say of the benevolence of the expatriating scheme ?

IV. But can the Colonization Society be considered a benevolent scheme, since from its very commencement to the present time, it *has opposed all emancipation, and the abolition of slavery in the United States, except in its own way*; i. e. by a very gradual process accompanied by the colonizing of the liberated : and has presented no plea and professed no desire for manumission, or for the education of coloured persons, on any other ground. “It is in nowise allied to any abolition society in America, or elsewhere, and is ready, whenever there is need, to pass a censure upon such societies in America.” (*J. B. Harrison, Af. Repos., III. 332.*) “To these, the Colonization Society would say, your object is unattainable, your zeal dangerous, and nothing can give it a right direction or a right temperature, but your surrendering your plan to ours.” (*Idem, III. 203.*) “Let the abolitionist give up his cause, as impossible of execution, hateful to the community, ruinous to the cause of the blacks, and founded upon principles wrong in themselves.” (*R. J. Breckenridge, Af. Repos., IX. 331.*) “With the enthusiasts of the North, I embark not in the wild and destructive scheme, which calls on the South for immediate and universal emancipation.” (*R. F. Stockton, Af. Repos., I. 13.*) “So frequent were manumissions in Maryland and Virginia, before counteracted by legal preventions, as to throw upon the public an immense mass of wretched people.” (*Editorial, Af. Repos., I. 162.*) “The inconvenience and danger of multiplying their number [i. e. of free coloured persons] where slavery exists at all.” (*C. F. Mercer, Af. Repos., IV. 53.*) “This law (the law

forbidding emancipated persons to remain in Virginia longer than a year after emancipation,) odious and unjust as it may at first view appear, and hard as it may seem to bear upon the liberated negro, was doubtless dictated by sound policy ; and its repeal would be regarded by none with more unfeigned regret than by the friends of African Colonization. It has restrained many masters from giving freedom to their slaves, and has thereby contributed to check the growth of an evil already too great and formidable." (*Memorial to Virginia Legislature*, Af. Repos., V. 20, 21.) " Its members are sustaining the wise policy of the law of Virginia, forbidding slaves emancipated since May 1806, to reside within the State." (*Lynchburg Col. Soc.*, Af. Repos., V. 241.) " Whatever abolition may have done heretofore, in the States now free, it had done nothing and could do nothing in the slave States for the cause of humanity." (*F. S. Key*, Af. Repos., V. 364.) " Emancipation with the liberated to remain on this side of the Atlantic, is but an act of dreamy madness." (*G. W. P. Custis*, Af. Repos., V. 366.) " If the question were submitted, whether there should be either immediate or gradual emancipation of all the slaves in the United States without their removal or colonization, painful as it is to express the opinion, I have no doubt it would be unwise to emancipate them." (*H. Clay*, Af. Repos., VI. 5.) " A sense of their own safety required the painful prohibition." (*Idem*, 2d An. Report, 110.) " We would say, liberate them only on condition of their going to Africa or Hayti." (*Af. Repos.*, III. 26, quoted from an Indiana paper.)

These are the sentiments of Colonizationists generally, and hence the Society has constantly made an effort to engross the favor of the public, both by direct appeals to its prejudices, to its fears and its benevolence, and by open opposition to all abolitionists. The friends of the Society also boast of their success; "that the friends of colonization have done more in twelve years for the black race, than the abolitionists have done for twelve centuries." (*R. J. Breckenridge*, Af. Repos., IX. 328.) This last assertion is palpably false, yet so great is the hallu-

cination of some, that they believe it. We ask, however, can that institution which opposes the pulling down of such a system of sin, as American slavery, be called a benevolent society ; especially since it opposes with a fiery zeal, those very plans which have been elsewhere successful in destroying that system ? Many of its members admit that if ever the Colonization Society succeeds, it can only be in the course of a “ century ” or centuries. (*Af. Repos.*, V. 367.) Thus then, all the evils of slavery are to be continued for a century, that the Colonization Society may have a fair trial to succeed.

V. Lastly, can that Society be entitled to the aid of the benevolent, which misrepresents and slanders those who are in this country, opposing slavery as a sin ? Since the excitement began in our country, the Colonization Society seems to have taken pains by every possible method to prevent those persons who are more immediately interested in the abolition of slavery, from becoming acquainted with the true views and motive of abolitionists. It is to this that the excitement may be chiefly ascribed. The Colonizationists having engrossed the public attention in the South, by the clamor which, in connection with the defenders of slavery in the abstract, they have raised against the abolitionists, have almost entirely prevented the latter from being heard. The Society, encouraged by almost all Colonizationists, has even taunted the abolitionists with cowardice, after having succeeded in rendering them unjustly odious. “ He is a cowardly soldier, who gets beyond the reach of his adversary before he fires his gun. Why do not these anti-slavery lecturers come among us, who are so enveloped in darkness and guilt, and point out to us our iniquity and our danger, our duty and the manner in which we may perform it.” (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 227.) This bravado is commended too, when the Society knows that,—principally owing to her false representations—an abolitionist’s life would be forfeited, if he went into the South to explain his views and propose that plan for the removal of slavery which he believes safe, practicable and happy for all concerned. Colonizationists generally have united in the slanderous cry, against the

abolitionists, of "incendiarism, fanaticism, &c." The Society charges them with *lying*; (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 274.) condescends in the fervor of zeal for abolition in *its own way*, to record with approbation that a check was given to abolition in Kentucky; (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 285.) charges the abolitionists with producing "an excitement deplored by every friend of the constitution;" and has even given the sanction of its name to the proposition to prevent the press in the North from speaking about slavery. Eminent Colonizationists, such as Mr. Clay, Mr. Key and Mr. Everett, (Governor of Massachusetts,) have recommended legislation against abolitionists.*

To judge of the truth and virtue of the Society, let any one read the African Repository for October 1835, (Vol. XI.)—a document set forth by a benevolent society!—It is edifying to compare the sentiments of the Society, with those uttered about the same time by an advocate for slavery in the abstract—whom Colonizationists pronounce "odious in thought." "We are of those who believe the South has nothing to fear from a servile war. We do not believe the abolitionists intend, nor could they if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection. The danger of this is remote. We believe we have most to fear from the organized action upon the consciences and fears of the slaveholders themselves—from the insinuations of their dangerous heresies* into our schools and pulpits and do-

* Colonizationists, governed as they admit by prejudice, have recommended both civil and ecclesiastical legislation against abolitionists: e. g. *Gov. Everett*, of Massachusetts; *Gov. Wolf*, of Pennsylvania; *Mr. Clay*, of Kentucky—(at the annual meeting of Colonization Society, Dec. 1835,—Washington City); *Mr. Key*, prosecuting attorney of the District of Columbia, (see the trial of Dr. Crandall in which Mr. Key labored hard to convict Dr. Crandall of doing and saying what he had himself said, making it evident, as was affirmed by the lawyers at the trial, that the whole was a contest between the Colonization Society and the abolitionists;)—*Rev. Mr. Bacon*, of New Haven, an eminent Colonizationist introduced the resolutions which were adopted by the general associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts—the evident design of the mover being to shut out from a hearing the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society.—Colonizationists have rendered that treatment to the abolitionists, of which in the early life of the Colonization Society, itself so much complained. (See Vol. I. and II. and VII. 99, of *Af. Repos.*.)

mestic circles." (*United States Telegraph*, November 24th, 1835.)

Alas! that this "great and benevolent" institution should thus stand reprobated, and convicted of slander, by a defender of slavery as right in itself; as being "the best existing organization of civil society." The Colonization Society knows that the abolitionists deprecate a servile insurrection, that they abhor the thought of slave murders &c., yet she bears false witness against them to the South. Where is the benevolence of this scheme which appears even to need falsehood for its support?



CHAPTER II.

DOES THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY PURSUE A REASONABLE AND JUDICIOUS COURSE?—IS ITS SCHEME PRACTICABLE?—IS THE SOCIETY NECESSARY?—CONCLUDING REMARKS;
WM. JAY AND DR. REESE.

SECTION 1. *Is the course of the Society judicious?*

A certain mode of feeling is generated, of the utter unreasonableness of which "the mind is dimly conscious, and to rid itself of the uneasy sense of being absurd, rushes on towards sentiments still more absurd, that by their aid it may quite surround itself with false impressions, and lose all recollection of calm truths." (*Fanaticism*, p. 23.)

It is proposed by the Colonization Society, to colonize *free coloured* persons, either those who are already free, or those who may be put into its hands to be colonized that they may be free: and thus to colonize all.

1. *To colonize those who are already free.* The Society must necessarily, if it would not destroy its colony, send out emigrants of good moral character. Hence it labors to induce the best of those who are among us to go. This operation pursued extensively is not salutary in its influence upon the free coloured people as a body. We

* "Dangerous heresies." i. e. the doctrine that slavery is a sin, and an evil; for the editor avows his belief of the propriety of slavery and of its continuance.—He and his friends take consistent ground, at least.

shall not dwell upon the strange inconsistency of sending out "nuisances," or, persons "*partly civilized and Christianized*" to Christianize them in Africa, and through them to civilize and Christianize Africa itself—a point on which the Colonization Society has opened itself to a charge ; but we will admit that the Society has ever been desirous of sending out "select emigrants." It picks out, then, the sound limbs of a corrupted and corrupting body, as it says, and deports them to a more congenial soil. So doing, the Society is constantly aggravating the evil at home. This is the necessary, legitimate result. Suppose, for instance, that of the five thousand free coloured people in the city of Baltimore, in 1826, the portion which exerted a wholesome influence on the entire mass,—the "*some*" who were entitled to the "respect" of Mr. Harper,—amounted to one hundred ; while the whole were separated by an "insurmountable barrier from the whites," and the great majority of them of little moral worth, "degraded and miserable." Would not the abduction of the influence exerted by the respectable and virtuous hundred, be soon felt ?—felt not only on the coloured mass, but on the whole of society ? Nay, would not the departure of one-fourth part, or one-tenth part of those who constitute a good leaven, affect injuriously the entire community ? It would be just as reasonable to draw a sound tooth from a jaw in which almost all are decayed, as to remove an educated and virtuous free coloured person from an ignorant and degraded coloured community. Such removals always have exerted and always will exert an evil influence upon the portion remaining at home. It is very questionable whether our cities and our country in general, are pursuing a policy, in this particular, which will tend to secure public order, tranquillity, sobriety and good morals. The emigration of the better class of coloured people from Philadelphia and New York, would be an event much to be deplored. And in the South, take the case of those three individuals, whose exclusion from the right of voting, by the new constitution of North Carolina, occasioned expressions of public regret. Such men by their connection with coloured people, would serve as a moral restraint on

them, and as a safe-guard to the whites in case the slaves should make or meditate trouble. Their example and conduct altogether is known to be admirable. The writer has seen and conversed with many individuals in the South, whose expatriation it would be wise in the slaveholding community to oppose.—If the Colonization Society should gain its object and induce the better class of free coloured persons to remove to Liberia, not only would the whole as a body deteriorate, but a large portion of the white population would deteriorate with them. And this deterioration would progress in proportion to the success which would attend the Society. This is a matter of serious regret, if not of alarm.

It may be said ‘if the best go first, the rest will follow.’ But *will* they do so voluntarily? We cannot compel them. That would be, not Colonization, but expatriation and the deportation of felons. Or suppose they will go, either of their own accord or by compulsion. Will the Colonization Society take them? Will it not deprecate their going? Will the colonists receive them? Will they not be obliged eventually to lay a prohibition on the importation of such persons? If they should shut their ports against an influx of the refuse of the population of this land, what then shall we do? Wait a “century” again before another place could be within reach?—It is very probable, not to say certain, that as the colony advances in improvement, a regard to their own welfare will induce the colonists to adopt some such measure for self-defence. Else there is much reason to fear their boasted privileges will all be good for nothing. Has the public forgotten the influence upon the colony at Liberia, of the two “cargoes of vagabonds,” which Mr. Breckenridge says were “*coerced away from Virginia, as truly as if it had been done with a cart whip.*” (*Speech, Feb. 1834.**) The colony has not forgotten it. The Society has not forgotten it; and with good reason does she yet remember it. It had nearly ruined the colony, and the

* In the discussion of the Colonization question in Glasgow, Scotland, Mr. Breckenridge says this is an “unfair report:” and charges the Editor of the Evangelist with giving it “to serve a special purpose.” Such an

Society too. But if "two cargoes" could produce such mischief in 1832, what will not twenty or fifty in 1932? The Board of Managers have not forgotten the oversight they committed, and for which they were severely berated by some of their best friends; and having learned wisdom by experience, they will be very careful in future. The Southampton massacre was the leading cause of driving off those wretched people. Some of them were whipped to make them willing to go. This, as Mr. Breckenridge says, was "the concentrated virulence of public odium." (*N. Y. Observer*, Feb. 15, 1834.) Should such troubles again occur, as they will, if slavery continues, what will the Society do? Confess its incompetency, refuse a passport to the miserable "outcasts" who may be coerced under similar circumstances, (thus tempting the Southern people to transport them themselves, and of their own accord to make Liberia a Botany Bay,) or again jeopardize their own existence and the happiness of every colonist, by receiving all who will come or be sent, whatever may be their moral character?

The Society recovered from the shock, but it has now confessedly relinquished the hope of building up the colony from the free coloured people. It looks to the slave-holders of the South, and informs us that many masters through the kindly influence of the Society, are willing to liberate their slaves on condition of their going to Liberia. The Society is beginning to see that the free coloured people generally are hostile to its designs, and will not go under its auspices. (*See R. J. Breckenridge's Speech*, February, 1834.) And we are glad of it. Not only have the free coloured people already been injured by the abduction of the influence of men whom the Colonization Society transported, but some of those men, had they re-

assertion, implicating the character of Mr. Leavitt, is as base as it is untrue. The New York *Observer*, Feb. 15, 1834, gives the passage thus—"experience has made us cautious how we connive at the transportation to Africa, as heralds of civilization and religion, of free vagabonds, coerced away against their will, by the concentrated virulence of public odium, as really as if they were manacled and carried away beneath the hatchets." Here is no essential difference. And doubtless Mr. B. knew they were whipped to make them willing to go.

mained at home, would have given less ambiguous proof of Christian character. If then the Society adheres to its professed determination to remove none but those of good character, how is it ever to benefit the free coloured people in general?—or if it eventually departs from this, how is it ever to build up a Christian society there? Or what security can the Society give, that as soon as the colonists have reached that stage of improvement which will give them universally a knowledge of their strength and their rights—they will not be unwilling to jeopardize their own security and happiness by admitting all sorts of persons! Will they not feel equal jealousy against the introduction of those of their own colour who are unlettered and vicious, which is so extensively felt in this country against foreign emigrants and paupers?

2. The Colonization Society will deport those who may be liberated for this purpose; or more correctly *will take away those who may be entrusted to it for the purpose of transporting them that they may be free in Africa.* What does a man prize dearer than freedom? “We utter the common sentiment of mankind, when we say, none ever continue slaves, a moment after they are conscious of their ability to retrieve their freedom.” (*R. J. Breckenridge, Af. Repos., IX. 326.*) Yet some have been offered their freedom, upon condition of their going to Liberia, and have preferred bondage to such freedom. Had it indeed been proved to their conviction, that freedom would have been *happily* secured to them in Africa; had it not been “matter of conjecture or calculation,” they would probably have gone. Hundreds, however, of these ignorant and unfortunate slaves have been sent out, whether willing or unwilling, and many others are offered to the Society. But if these alone are the inhabitants of a colony, it is doubtful whether their literary and moral state will for a time be much removed from barbarism, though they may have been taught a sort of Tantalus-like* admiration of “our free institutions.” The Society sends, say forty, from one plantation, the master of which had all at once

* *Tantalus* is represented by the heathen poets as punished in hell, with an insatiable thirst, and placed up to his chin in a pool of water, which

become convinced that it was wrong to keep human beings as property. Some of these are worthless, degraded and injurious. **NONE, OR VERY FEW, CAN READ.** In the colony they must learn the elements of education. If, as some say, they are incapable of learning here, will crossing the ocean sharpen their natural wit? Rather will they not find the same motives there operating, which would have operated here, had these unfortunate beings been liberated and kindly dealt with? The same reasons which render it desirable they should be instructed in Africa, make it desirable they should be instructed here. But, passing this by, some of these forty may be religious persons, but without knowledge to guide them. And is it likely that in a colony, where preachers are merchants, and the poor slave first begins to breathe free air; where "the world" is rushing upon him, and cares burdening him; is it likely that he will vastly improve? The inevitable consequence of huddling together ignorant persons, is a perpetuation of ignorance with its attendant evils.—The "increased severity of the slave code," while it may prove a part of the moral influence of the Colonization Society, will nevertheless be a great barrier in the way of its success. This has already been shown in some considerable degree. Hence the deplored evils of ignorance and idleness in the colony: hence the fact that even preachers in the colony, men whom we might suppose to know the sweets of freedom, and whom we should expect to be virtuous, acted so "nefariously," when the colony was in distress, "as to charge the Society three or four hundred per cent. on articles *for the use of the poor*, and for the support of the colony." (*R. J. Breckenridge's Speech, Feb. 1834.*) In this view, how just are the observations of Professor Silliman. "It will be as much as they can do to manage the slaves who are emancipated on condition

flows away as soon as he attempts to taste it. A bough richly loaded with delicious fruit hangs above his head, which as soon as he attempts to seize is driven out of his reach by a sudden gust of wind. If this were not fable, we should deem it almost prophetic, and that an American slave had sat for the picture. Poor slave, how must he have admired the water and the fruit!—the "free institutions of" C. C. Harper.

of immediate emigration, and who must therefore be received as they are: but it is most obvious that no African colony can flourish, which does not contain a good proportion of religious, moral and instructed men: men who have some acquaintance with business, and with useful arts and trades, and who are qualified to manage the concerns of a recent and immature community.” (*Af. Repos.*, VIII. 173.) We would therefore remind the Colonization Society, and the Southerners generally, that, admitting deported slaves are “fit for freedom,” to use the language of Mr. R. W. Bailey, the slaves thus fitted are not the persons whom they ought to deport. If they are prepared for freedom by good moral habits, and established virtue, they are all needed at home. Southerners should beware how they send off the best they have. Of the whole coloured population, *the best ought not to be sent*, and the rest *the Society will not take*.

SEC. 2. *Is the Colonization Society adequate to the task it has undertaken.*

Is the Colonization Society capable of accomplishing the task it has entered upon—viz: *to rid the United States of slavery?* I do not affirm that the Society avows in *its CONSTITUTION*, that it is the only practicable method of destroying the deadly curse of slavery in the United States: but it is apparent that many intelligent Colonizationists indulge this hope, and avow it. Nay, if this were not the case, no reason can be assigned why so much bitter opposition should be manifested by the Society and Colonizationists generally, against all other efforts to remove slavery, by those who are not Colonizationists. That Colonizationists indulge this hope is evident also from the fact that while they oppose every other plan but their own, they still express the hope that the United States will be delivered from slavery, and in connexion with this hope still continue their operations in opposition to unconditional emancipation.*

*Dr. Reese in his letters to Mr. Jay, p. 4, 5, flatly denies that the Colonization Society esteems itself the only remedy for slavery, yet this is asserted by those who are as well entitled to credit as himself. Thus, Mr.

I. Let us now meet the question. Is the Colonization scheme adequate to this task it has undertaken? There are now in the United States, upwards of 2,500,000 slaves, or more than 3,000,000 of coloured persons, slave and free. "Their annual increase, from 1830 to 1840, will not be very much from 80,000 a year." (*R. J. Breckenridge, Af. Repos., IX. 331.*) "In 1840," Matthew Carey says "they will amount to 3,045,504, in 1870, to 7,500,000 nearly." The Christian Spectator says "their number doubles in less than 20 years: things remaining as they now are, we shall have in 1880, 12,000,000 of slaves." (*Ch. Spectator, 1823.*) By the lowest calculation, unless some unforeseen calamity occurs, to arrest the increase, there will be in 1940, "a century" hence, 100,000,000, of coloured persons in the present national limits of our territory. The Colonization scheme, whether the present number of the coloured people, or their probable number in years future be considered, proposes to remove millions of people to a foreign land, or to induce them to remove themselves, i. e. by keeping up and strengthening the existing prejudice against colour, to "make it their interest to remove." But during the twenty years in which the Society has been in operation, it has not *removed more than the present INCREASE OF THREE WEEKS!* Yet the Society boasts of its success, and of the rapidly increasing strength of the colony at Liberia. Nevertheless, on the admission of Colonizationists themselves, not two thousand persons yearly can be ear-

Gerrit Smith, (then a Colonizationist) says: "we find the Society, setting itself up not only as the exclusive fit means of promoting the interests of our free coloured population, but even as the *only* means which could be rightfully employed to deliver this land from the curse of slavery," &c. (*Af. Repos., XI. 70.*) See the passages quoted above, Chap. I., beginning of section second, or the Repository generally: *e. g.* IV. 268; III. 197; III. 355; III. 66; IV. 299; IX. 331; II. 188; VIII. 172; V. 366; particularly the whole of Mr. Smith's observations, XI. 70. Dr. Reese admits, p. 5., that it would be "arrogance" in the Colonization Society to assume this ground, and that it would be "utterly absurd to suppose that the allegation can have any foundation in truth." This reckless and false assertion is but a specimen of Dr. Reese's book. Could the Colonization Society have found no advocate more just, candid and veracious than Dr. Reese? or are advocates possessing better character, ashamed to appear?

ried thither at this present time. Thus Mr. Bacon, addressing the Society, in February, 1834, says, "I cannot but think it a mistaken kindness to send 700 emigrants to Africa with our means, in a single year." (*Af. Repos.* XI. 361.) It will probably be ten years before the colony will be able to bear even the gradual annual addition of 2,000 in each year. But during that period, the coloured population will have increased more than 500,000, over and above the whole possible amount of deportation during that period. It will probably be twenty years, and it may be more, before the colony can sustain 20,000 people, but during that same period, the coloured population in this country will have increased by 2,000,000, and more.

Rusticus expectat dum transeat amnis ; at ille
Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.

By what calculation therefore is it, that the Colonization Society proposes to rid the United States of Slavery?* Their process is as wise as that of measuring off the ocean with a quart pot.—But to give the Colonization Society credit for what it asks ; it supposes that such will be the state of society generally in the United States, and such its state in Liberia, that the coloured people will feel themselves impelled by "moral influence" to emigrate from this country thither. That this might possibly be the case, if they were few in number, we shall not now question. But when thousands upon thousands of our coloured population shall have found a comfortable home among us, as they will in spite of prejudice and oppression,—having really been "taught to admire our free institutions,"—before the colony of Liberia shall have reached even a population of 20,000, it will be no easy matter to persuade or coerce them away. But can Colonizationists seriously hope that ever a period will

* The scheme of Colonization, in order to be *effectual* must contemplate and effect the deportation *at once* of 3,000,000 of laborers, and the importation of at least 1,000,000 to take their place;" more than this; it must, by miracle, work habits of industry in the white population of the South.

arrive when thousands will go in one year across the ocean to seek a home in Africa? They ask for a century to complete their labor. When that has elapsed, will they not as wisely ask for a century of centuries? Indeed when we compare the requests of the Society with the admission of one of its Vice Presidents in 1824, we can believe that nothing but the blindest infatuation could lead it to imagine itself adequate in any degree, to remove the coloured population, or to induce them to remove. It will in truth require AGES. "*The removal of a few thousand individuals will, in an evil of such magnitude, produce but little effect; it will not materially benefit this class of population themselves, for it consists of more than a million and a half of persons, (1824; now, 1837, 3,000,000,) AND THOUGH 3 OR 400,000 ALREADY FREE SHOULD BE REMOVED, the great political mischief among us will be but slightly affected.*" (R. J. Harper, V. P., 1824, 7th Report, p. 8.) This passage is worthy the attention of the Colonizationists.

II. Let the community look in the face, all the difficulties with which this scheme is encumbered and say, is success possible? Not only is it rendered impracticable by the vastness of the undertaking, but there are other obstacles. It is not merely problematical whether slave masters will ever consent to part with their slaves, through Colonization influence. The difficulties in the way of persuading them are constantly increasing; and indeed what has the Colonization Society to hope for from the rising generation of slave-holders, when the example of the present race, their fathers, teaches them the lawfulness and propriety of slavery.—There are many nullifiers in the South, and there may yet be many more, some of whom seem almost ready to take up arms whenever the general government offers to patronize the Colonization Society.—There are many abolitionists both in the North and in the South, who are increasing in strength and moral influence.—Then the coloured people are themselves determined against the Society; the free will scarcely go at all, and the slave will scarcely go unless compelled.—There are the difficulties which attend

every new settlement; difficulties which those accustomed to freedom find hard to contend with, and which are still harder to him who has been a slave all his life. Hence we find that many colonists at Liberia give way under them. Even if we admit that Africa is a healthy country for the coloured man, still we assert that it is less healthy than America. The coloured people know this; and endangering life first in crossing the ocean and then in a new settlement will and should be avoided whenever it well can be. There are difficulties also with the natives. Since the first settlement at Monrovia, the colonists have had three pitched battles and two or three skirmishes with the natives. Does this fact show a prospect of amalgamation between the parties? (see also, *Af. Repos.*, X. 317, 318.) Moreover if thousands are willing to go, where are the means? Settlers must be taken care of by the public there, till they are acclimated,* and if it has cost the Society, including \$130,000 received from government for the settlement of recaptured Africans, about \$500,000 to build up a colony of 4000 people, i. e., about \$125 per head, including all expenses—to remove one million will at the same rate cost about one hundred and twenty-five million of dollars. If from this be deducted \$25,000,000, (the cost of transportation at twenty-five dollars a head, in American vessels) the remainder would be a total loss to this country. If to this sum be added the money and goods transported thither with set-

* Colonization agents pass through the country asking for \$25, "to carry a man to Africa, and make him a freeman." Do they not know that it costs much more than this to settle an emigrant? It costs \$100 and more. Where then is the truth of their statements? Twenty-five dollars is the passage fee. This is beside the expense of the voyage, and, of keeping every emigrant for months. "How long does the seasoning last?" From 3 to 24 months. "What would be necessary to enable a man to live comfortably, if he went from here to Liberia?" "A suitable set of utensils, furniture, clothes, for 2 or 3 years, enough of food to last till he could raise a crop." (*Questions to Jones, and replies.* Af. *Repos.* X. 318.)

It is desirable that some person who has time, would estimate the number of deaths which have occurred in the colony, of Agents, &c., including children; (see a list of emigrants, *Af. Repos.*, X. 292,) and inquire how far the increase of the population by births has fallen short of that of the United States, and we shall have data from which the real prosperity of the country can be estimated.

tlers, as gifts, there will be to the United States for settling 1,000,000 of coloured persons a total loss of probably 150,000,000 of dollars. Any action of Congress on the Society's own admission, is an action in favor of an association for *the removal of Slavery*. It must not expect that Southerners and Northerners will ever consent that the government shall violate the constitution of the United States in its behalf. Had the Society the purse of the nation at its disposal, it has no right to use it, especially since both the justice and the benevolence of its scheme are more than questionable.

III. But the Colonization scheme contains in itself the elements of defeat. It admits, which ought never to be admitted, that slaves are property. Hence it endeavors to conciliate the slave-holders by admitting what they call their "rights"—(see *speech of Cyrus Edwards*, Af. Repos., VII. 100, and of *Henry Clay*, Af. Repos., VII. 13.) All the attacks of Colonizationists upon those who advocate unconditional emancipation except as they spring from retaliation or revenge, or mere malignity, are based upon this, that one party admits, while the other denies the right of property.—Now it is of the nature of property to be in demand, and to be produced, according to its value; and its value at any one time is regulated by supply and demand. Slaves, by the removal from their vicinity of the "dangerous" free coloured people, or of those liberated for the purpose of removal, become more valuable, and the system of slavery is more safe. This is admitted by some Colonizationists. Thus if, by some process—poison or deportation—you remove all the horses from the city of Philadelphia, there would soon be an influx of as many more from the surrounding country, and, until the demand was satisfied, they would be sold at an advanced price. But would the influx of a thousand horses into Philadelphia, in one week diminish the race, or remove it from the neighborhood? By no means. *Horses are property*. Farmers would be careful to retain as many as they wanted themselves, for labor and *breeding*:—destruction of some within a given space would increase the value of the rest, and this would induce those

who had the means, to breed more, until the equilibrium should again return. Destroy one-half the horses in the world, and the process would be the same in principle, though the relative value might never again be as low as it now is. Remove one-half the slaves from South Carolina, and while slaves are held as property, there would be an increased demand, and such an effort to supply it, that in a short time the same state of things as formerly existed would return. So will it be, throughout the South. If one-half the slaves in the world were suddenly to die, while the principle that man may be held as property is acknowledged, the aggregate number would in a short time be nearly or quite what it was before. If no other means would suffice, masters would cohabit with their own slaves, that they might increase the number of their human chattels.—Colonization in this view of it, while it renders slaves as property more secure, does but hold out a bait to the covetousness of slave-holders, instead of diminishing the evils and rigors of slavery.

Besides, if slaves were not acknowledged as property, the gradual emigration of hundreds of thousands, cannot so affect the great body of the coloured race among us, as ever to render practicable the removal of the whole. What effect has emigration on Germany? Thousands are every year seeking new settlements, and this has continued since the early days of Rome. But is Germany decreasing in population? Ireland has sent off her thousands every year, for many years past. Is there any more room in Ireland for the English than at first? All this emigration has not perceptibly diminished the ratio of the increase of population in Germany and Ireland. The true state of this case appears by the following remarks. "In the year 1790, there were in that small portion of Virginia's territory, which lies between her blue ridge of mountains and her sea-shore, 25,000 more whites than blacks. Since that time we have been constantly engaged, from this same district, in colonizing with blacks the States of Georgia, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida, and yet in 1830, there were in that district, where this majority of

25,000 whites once existed, a majority of 81,000 blacks : showing an increase, in forty years, of 106,000 blacks. If with all the advantages of our thousands of *scavengers*, in the shape of negro-buyers,* who have been *constantly and sedulously engaged in tending and nursing this filthy drain*, this wonderful increase has occurred, what are we to expect in the next forty years?"† (*Mr. Roane, in the Virginia Legislature, 1832.*) Does the Colonization Society then hope to accomplish more in relation to the coloured race among us, than all the oppressions in Germany, Austria and Ireland, or even in the eastern part of Virginia (and Maryland,) have accomplished in respect to those who dwelt in those places respectively ? Or does she, intend to urge the North to drive away the already persecuted and tyrant-trodden coloured race ?—or which is the same thing—does she intend to labor till the prejudice against colour which urges the removal of that race, shall be enthroned in the National breast ? If so, and I fear it,—she will stand convicted before God and her country of destroying the happiness and the liberties of millions.

SEC. 3. *Is the Colonization Society necessary?*

Is the Colonization Society at all necessary? Before proceeding to answer this query, which will be the last in relation to the Society, let us observe:—

(1.) We consider the Colonization Society a scheme of **INJUSTICE**. " Its movements do but sanction and encourage, the most high-handed oppression. This it does by the admission of the principle that emancipation may be [and ought to be] conditioned on expatriation." (*Phelps Lectures, App. 278, 279.*)

(2.) Admitting that the scheme of Colonization will benefit Africa in a greater or less degree, it is not necessary

* Or Colonization packets, or transports.

† During the last year it is estimated that 120,000 slaves have been exported from Virginia. These were worth on an average \$600 each, equal to \$72,000,000.—During this period how many were colonized in Africa from the same State? *Not two hundred.*

if that benefit can be conferred in an equal or greater degree in some less exceptionable—some benevolent way.*

(3.) It is very questionable whether the moral influence of the Society can be very great or very good. When “weighed in the balance” of the divine law it is “found wanting.” For (1) it acknowledges that man may have property in his fellow man, thus encouraging sin: (2) it admits the tyrant’s plea of necessity for present acknowledged wrong;—(3) its benevolence operates through prejudice; (4) it enlists the covetousness of slaveholders in its behalf; (5) its influence stands decidedly in the way of emancipation.

Is then this Society, necessary?—It consumes money, employs the time of valuable men, and diverts the mind of benevolence, from other objects. Would it not be better for it to die? “An honest death would be a thousand fold better for it, than a life of fraud.” (*Gerrit Smith*, then Vice President, Af. Repos., XI. 70.)—If necessary, it is either as an Abolition Society, or as an institution for the promotion of some other benevolent enterprise. But it is neither.

1st. By its own admission “it is no Abolition Society.” It passes many “censures on such Societies.” Take for an example the following, from the pen of its Secretary. “The Anti-Slavery Societies at the North, as at present conducted, are, I humbly conceive, staking the peace and safety of the country on a dangerous experiment.” (*Af. Repos.*, X. 137.) Some of the friends of the Society do indeed claim that it proposes the ultimate abolition of slavery, but on a condition—even according to their admission—which we have shown to be impossible:—the removal of all the slaves. “*All emancipation, to however small an extent, which permits the persons emancipated to remain in this country, is an evil.* (*First Report of the Colonization Society.*) Thus Colonizationists are, in effect, saying it is right to keep up and strengthen a system of robbery, lust, barbarism, and impiety, unless those who suffer by its continuance will leave the country.

* Who can doubt that if slavery is abolished, multitudes of coloured missionaries would be found for Africa?

“Such a state of affairs would be produced by universal emancipation, that we could not live in the United States.” Perhaps by a change of conditions with the sufferers for a short time, they would better learn how to apply the fundamental principles of the gospel.* If 3,000,000 of the people of Europe were suffering under the pride, rapacity, lust, impiety, barbarism and luxury of 3,000,000 of their neighbors, would the Colonization Society justify the continuance of that oppression, till the oppressed would move beyond its reach? The Society devoutly prays for the abolition of the foreign slave trade, but neglects the suffering poor at its own door. Against the *piratical INTERNAL slave trade*—though not inferior in atrocity to the distant evil so much deplored—it never raises its voice. Nay, though this traffic is but a single item of the evils, real and manifest, which are near at hand, still with reference to those evils, “it is no Abolition Society.”

2nd. *Is this Society necessary as pursuing any other BENEVOLENT scheme?* The negative has been fully proved. It cannot be prospered by Heaven. All the good to the coloured race, it has ever accomplished might have been gained in a less objectionable manner, and infinitely more would have been gained if it had never existed. What if the colony is flourishing? Would not the same number, nay an hundred fold the number of coloured people have been in a better condition in this land, if Colonization had never been heard of? Would not the recaptured Africans have been in better circumstances, if Government had located them somewhere in this country, and appropriated \$130,000 for their benefit? Colonizationists seem to be aware that as soon as slavery is abolished, their scheme falls to the ground. Hence the benevolence of Finley is prostituted to the worst of purposes. Were he and his heavenly-minded coadjutor, Samuel J. Mills, alive on earth, they would disown the company which at present claims them: we doubt not they look down from heaven upon them with pity.

* “And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.” *Luke, 6: 31.*

Let it be observed that we admit--(1.) "That the colonizing of coloured or white persons with their own unrestrained consent, is in itself a harmless and innocent affair. (2.) To plant truly Christian colonies on the coast of Africa, or any where else, in this way, is a very laudable enterprise."—But this is not Colonization as developed, and now in actual operation.

SEC. 4. *Concluding Remarks.*

If it were admitted that the Colonization Society is advancing a benevolent scheme; that the scheme is practicable, though requiring centuries to complete it; that it is exercising a beneficial influence on Africa; that it has a right to apply to the general government for support;—in short were most admitted that Colonizationists in general ask;—would it not be the duty of the same to promote the abolition of slavery in other ways? If the Colonization Society adhered strictly to the letter of its constitution, it could not deport one slave entrusted to it, for the purpose of freeing him. (See *Const. of Col. Soc.* Art. I. and II.) It stepped out of its proper sphere, when it entered upon the removal of *slaves*, not of actual freemen, and has thus become a tool in the hands of tyrants, to remove those who would not have gone if they could have had their freedom here, and who were only willing to go because they had no alternative. A person may leave his slaves free by will—by "misguided piety or death-bed devise" as Mr. Garrison says, or "sudden conviction of injustice." (*Af. Repos.*, III. 197.) His executors construe this freedom conditional on their removal, and applying to the Colonization Society, they are removed. (See *Af. Repos.*, XI. 184. 1st and 4th cases of emancipation mentioned.)

Admitting that the Society is right in its position, that slavery must and will be removed, why does it so constantly strike at the abolitionist? Is it because the latter condemns its principles? Then it should be able to show that those principles are founded in reason and religion, and not upon *prejudice*. Though once the writer was a Colonizationist, an agent of the Society, and served it to

the best of his ability, because he cannot on maturer reflection and more knowledge approve its principles, he feels it his duty to preach, pray, write and speak against it.

Being requested by a friend to read "Jay's Inquiry," he felt so hostile to it, that he deferred it as long as he well could. He heard of "Reese's reply," and still deferred reading the former till he could read the latter also. In the meantime it pleased God to show him the *sin of slavery in all cases*. Objections then naturally started in his mind, to the scheme of Colonization, principally at first on the score of its insufficiency, which he had in part before believed. He spent days and nights in the examination of the African Repository, and the Reports of the Society. The result of the examination, may be seen in the present attempt to disseminate the truth on this subject of inexpressible importance.

Mr. Jay and Dr. Reese.

Notwithstanding the "*Imprimatur*" of such names as those which appear in Dr. Reese's reply to Judge Jay, the candid and careful reader will find in it, much blinking of the question,—"much irrelevant matter" and not a little blustering and egotism.* None of Mr. Jay's impor-

* We are strongly disposed to believe that even they who sanctioned Dr. Reese's book with their names, have discovered by this time that they set the seal to their own folly. We would, however, for fear that like the Pharisees of old they are wedded to error, desire them to observe the following language, and only suppose it barely possible that it has an application to themselves. They form a tolerably good comment on the "disingenuous, dangerous and sophistical" of a certain class of supereilious doctors. "How little ought we to regard the contempt and revilings of the scornful and unbelieving, though most eminent among men—when Jesus was reviled by a convention of Jewish Priests and rulers, as a notorious sinner, and the 'Lord of glory' was disdained as contemptible. But how unbecoming are such revilings, especially in those who are of superior rank and education,—plain unlettered sense will [sometimes] go further, in understanding the most important matters, than all the advantages of science, which often render men too self-sufficient to judge aright.—When arguments fail pertinacious disputers, they commonly have recourse to abusive language: and many show their pride and folly, by refusing to hear sense and argument from their supposed inferiors, and by answering them with contempt and upbraiding." (Dr. Scott's practical observations on John, IX. 24-41.) This unwillingness to hear, together with an

tant charges against the Colonization Society are answered or refuted. Mr. Jay, affirms that the Colonization Society proposes itself as the *only remedy for slavery*, and backs his charge by quotations from the published papers of the Society. Does his opponent grapple with the charge? He denies it flatly, in the face of evidence, and shows that the *Constitution of the Society says nothing about it!* (see *Jay*, p. 104. *Reese*, p. 4.) Mr. Jay affirms, that the Colonization Society opposes the moral cultivation of the coloured population at home. Dr. Reese shows that some Colonizationists do not. Yet the fact is, Colonizationists generally have made no effort to instruct the coloured race, except with the hope that they will emigrate to Africa. (See, for instance, the *Constitution of the "African Education Society,"* Wash. City, &c.)—Mr. Jay asserts that the Colonization Society assails and vilifies abolitionists. Dr. Reese “records” his “unequivocal denial.” This denial, however, is not founded on truth, if we may believe others. Thus Mr. Smith, then a Colonizationist, admits the charge. (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 70, 71. See also the quotation from Secretary Gurley, above, *Af. Repos.*, X. 137, and the last Volume of *Repository passim*.)—Mr. Jay affirms that the Society excuses and justifies slaveholders. Dr. Reese knows that not only himself, but Colonizationists generally, express sympathy for the whole herd of manstealers. But not to dwell upon all the misstatements and special pleading of the latter, (see *Reese*, pp. 2, 4, 9, 16, 35, 58, 94, 111, 112, 114, &c.,) let the candid reader examine for himself.—Even the Christian Spectator, a warm Colonization paper, complains “of the slighting terms which Dr. Reese has applied in his preface, to the work of Mr. Jay, not so much because they are slighting, as because they are not founded as we think in truth; pp. of preface 5, 7.” (See *Quart. C. Spec.* Sep., 1835.

obstinate adherence to prejudices, opinions, practices and forms, which cannot be sustained by enlightened minds, is the foundation of all this cry about “ultraism,” “radicalism,” &c. in the North, and about “incendiaries, &c., in the South, and of “disingenuous, dangerous and sophistical.”

p. 513.)—The Spectator however is justly liable to the same or worse charges.

That the cause of truth and justice will be promoted by such a book as that of Dr. Reese, few candid well-informed persons will affirm. It is indeed, as he says, a pity “that some abler hand had not been assigned for the task,” for which he harnessed himself. Malignant charges of fanaticism, incendiaryism, &c., urged unsparingly and coarsely against his fellow citizens, would perhaps have become the mouth of the impious, but from the defenders of a “benevolent institution” they fall with an ill grace. One possessing an abler pen, a better heart and a more candid mind—himself a munificent patron of the Colonization Society, admitted that in respect to the question of slavery, it, “had departed from the neutrality of its constitution.” (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 67.) Surely therefore it ought not to have provoked the ire of Dr. Reese so much, that Mr. Jay, whose honesty the Doctor admits is equal to his own, should affirm the same truth, and honestly bring other charges which he substantiates by testimony. Both Mr. Smith, (*Af. Repos.*, XI. 67, 68,) and Rev. Mr. Bacon of New Haven—who are, without exception, the most talented and able defenders of the Colonization cause—concede some grievous errors of the Society. They admit too that members of the Colonization Society may also be members of the anti-slavery society; yet Dr. Reese boldly charges all abolitionists with being fanatics. By members of that Society therefore of which he was the self-induced champion, he is proved guilty of falsehood; unless to be consistent he will charge his own friends and patrons with fanaticism. The success of Dr. Reese’s defence, however, may be estimated from a remark of the Christian Spectator, a co-champion of the same “client.” “We need follow Dr. Reese no furthur, only to add, that Mr. Jay’s apparent inconsistencies are made such, only by Dr. Reese withholding the connection and bearings in which the passages are found.” (*C. Spectator*, p. 514.) Was this the Doctor’s “special pleading”—or was it sterling honesty?

Dr. Reese and many of his friends are pleased to charge

all the members of the anti-slavery society with being “fanatics,” (*preface*, p. 8,) but neither has he proved his accusation, nor is it true.

1. *Dr. Reese has not proved that they are fanatics.* Here is his charge, accompanied, with his reason. “If the members of the anti-slavery society were not all fanatics, they would by this time discover, what is palpably manifest to every body else, that their doctrines and measures are only inflicting accumulating and irreparable mischiefs upon the oppressed race, for whose welfare and happiness they profess exclusive zeal and benevolence, and for whose good, many of them are doubtless conscientiously laboring. In the name of the afflicted free-blacks of the North and the South, I would point them to the new and oppressive legislation which they have provoked by their ill-timed endeavors, and the rash impetuosity of their blind and mistaken zeal. And in behalf of the slaves of this land, I would invoke their humanity and religion, while groaning under already intolerable laws, and beseech them to withhold themselves from efforts, which in their results have already aggravated the number and severity of the privations and hardships which bondage inflicts.” (*Preface*, pp. 8, 9.) This reason, thus sophistically assigned, is “special pleading” for tyrants. We would commend to Dr. Reese’s notice, at least a part of the following words :

“ O for a world in principle as chaste,
As this is gross and selfish ! over which
Custom and prejudice shall bear no sway,—
Nor cunning justify the proud man’s wrong—
Leaving the poor no remedy but tears;” &c. (*Task, VI.*)

Is not the Doctor’s pleading an endeavor to “justify the proud man’s wrong ?” Had Dr. Reese been a Roman in the time of the early emperors, for the same reason he now invokes abolitionists to cease their “conscientious efforts!” he would then have besought the preachers of the gospel to cease condemning the sports and games, the gladiatorial shows, the circus, saturnalia, &c. (none of which are by name condemned in scripture,) lest their condemn-

ing these should be the occasion of "more oppressive legislation" against their fellow Christians. On the same principle he would have urged Martin Luther and others not to inveigh so bitterly against the tyranny of the papal See, lest their boldness in reprobating sin, should provoke the monster Leo X. and his successors, more cruelly to injure the Waldenses, persecute the Huguenots and inquisitorially murder Jews and Christians. On this same principle, he would have besought the Redeemer not so bitterly to condemn the traditions of the Pharisees, lest he should be persecuted; and the apostles to forbear preaching Christ, lest the Sanhedrim should resent it. On the other hand an eminent Colonizationist (then such) tells us, that efforts for the good of others are not to be arrested because they are accompanied with incidental sufferings. This "involves a doctrine which would stop the wheels as well of divine as human benevolence;—the anti-slavery society therefore is not to be blamed, if it shall be, as we have supposed it may become, the innocent occasion of sufferings to some of the objects of its benevolent solicitude." (*Gerrit Smith, Af. Repos.*, XI. 66.) These sentiments we commend to Dr. Reese's attention. In them he will find no "cunning to justify the proud man's wrong."—None of that "gross and selfish principle which leaves the poor no remedy but tears." Does he say, "already intolerable laws," and can he then take part with the tyrant? Though in so doing he may not "come down," (p. 12,) he has located himself in the seat, not enviable, of the TYRANT'S PATRON.

Dr. Reese is an advocate of "health and temperance." He condemns *tight-lacing* and the *use of malt-liquors*. (See "*Strictures*" by D. M. Reese, M. D., New York 1825.) If the Doctor's strictures had enraged the *corset-makers* and *brewers*, and induced them to labor more effectually and more fatally to introduce their respective articles of manufacture into use, would not he have been *guilty* of all this?

Not the abolitionist, but SLAVERY is the cause of that "oppressive legislation" superadded to already intolerable laws. Let Dr. Reese think of the 70,000 members of

his own church who are in slavery, (p. 116,) and ask God whether He will not avenge His OWN POOR.

As to what Dr. Recse says on pages 101, 102 of his book, it is so like the spittings of an angry controversialist, whom passion has blinded, that I trust no abolitionist will ever notice it. His effort also to prove Mr. Jay, personally, a fanatic, does not call for a reply. His assigned reason, then, does not hold good. But

2. *Abolitionists are not fanatics.* This charge is not preferred by Dr. Reese alone, but is repeated again and again by the editors of the public papers, from some of whom, such as those of the New York Observer, better things might be expected, than that they would thus revile their fellow-men, and fellow-christians, and thus keep company with the real fanatics and incendiaries of the South.

What is fanaticism? for the term is often used by those who "want information" respecting its true meaning.—"Fanaticism," says a most discriminating writer, "is ENTHUSIASM INFLAMED BY HATRED. After quite rejecting from our account that opprobrious sense of the word fanaticism which the *virulent calumniator of religion and of the religious assigns to it*, it will be found, as we believe, that the elementary idea attaching to the term in its manifold applications, is that of '*fervor in religion, rendered turbulent, morose or rancorous, by junction with some one or more of the UNSOCIAL EMOTIONS.*'" (*Fanaticism*, p. 21.) Now it cannot be maintained with the least show of evidence, that abolitionists are in their religion, which Dr. Reese allows them, (pp. 8, 9.) inflamed with hatred towards any individual, or that they are under the influence of "unsocial emotions." Their contest with their fellow men, is an effort to render the social emotions triumphant. We do not charge Dr. Reese and his companions with being fanatics, (this might be as ungentlemanly and unbecoming in us, as it was in himself,) but we beg them candidly to inquire and see who are most under the influence of *unsocial emotions*,—the slaveholder and his patron the Colonizationist on the one hand, or on the other hand, the abolitionist who seeks to destroy the detestable

and unsocial feeling that the coloured race *must remove* from America. As respects the elements of fanaticism, (see *Fanaticism*, p. 54) will some dispassionate inquirer tell us whether they enter most into the composition of that scheme which calls aloud upon all men, every where, *now and always* to do justice to all, or that which concludes that God has placed an insurmountable barrier—“through corrupt favoritism,” between members of the same general family. Abolitionists do not contend that “special favors are granted to nations, to families and to individuals, who are honored and benefited by immense advantages, notwithstanding enormous delinquencies.” (*Fanaticism*, p. 272.) This is slavery as supported by Charlestonians “on moral and scriptural grounds,” (see *Resolution of City of Charleston*, Aug. 1835,) or in a milder form—emancipation necessarily accompanied with deportation. The true Christian, however, is taught the very reverse of this in the Bible. “Exclusiveness of feeling is denied him, nor can he harbor that grudging of grace, which distinguishes the fanatic.” (p. 276.) Dr. Reese and the pro-slavery defenders should have charity enough, while their fellow Christians declare these to be their rules of action, to believe them sincere. It is to be hoped that Colonizationists will not any longer wilfully say “Raca” and “thou fool” to brethren! Let me conclude by desiring the attention of such, to the following language addressed by Bishop Horsley to the British House of Lords. “Beware how you are persuaded to bring under the opprobrious name of fanaticism, the regard which you owe to the great duties of justice and mercy; for the neglect of which, if you should neglect them, you will be answerable at that tribunal where no prevarication of witnesses can misinform the Judge—where no subtlety of an advocate, miscalling the names of things, ‘putting evil for good and good for evil,’ can mislead His judgment.” (*Speech against slave trade*, July 1799.)



